

REMARKS

In the aforementioned office communication, the examiner opined the reissue declaration was defective because the error which is relied upon to support the reissue application was not felt by the examiner to be an error upon which a reissue can be based. In explaining his position, the examiner stated the subject matter of newly added claims 24-34 was directed to the guiding function of the loops of claims 1-23 being incorporated into the engaging collar. The examiner did not feel this arrangement was disclosed in the original patent. Further, claims 1-34 were rejected based upon a defective reissue declaration for the same reasons. In addition, claims 24-34 were rejected under § 112 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the invention. In other words, the examiner noted, in his judgment, there was no support in the specification as originally filed for the guiding function of the loops to be incorporated into the engaging collars.

The examiner's attention is directed to column 10, line 65 through column 11, line 8 of the patent as was also referenced in applicant's statement filed with the reissue application. At this location in the patent, it will be noted the patent provides that "the function of the guiding loops 21 of the blind 1 could be incorporated into the engaging collars 25. In this regard, a plurality of collars 25 could be slidably mounted about each auxiliary tilt cord 14, 15 and about its associated rear vertical member 17, 19, between each adjacent pair of cross-rungs 29, or between selected pairs of cross-rungs of the rear vertical member 17, 19." The patent further states in column 11, line 5 etc., that while guiding loops 21 are preferably used in the blinds, when no guiding loops are used, both a rear vertical member and its associated auxiliary tilt cord could be within the central passage of each collar 25.

Accordingly, it is felt the grounds for applicant's request for reissue of this application are well supported in the patent. To further substantiate this disclosure, a

Application No. 10/624,938
Attorney Docket No. 1453/US/2
Express Mail No. EV683297909US

new drawing, Fig. 8, is being added to the patent with this amendment. Fig. 8 illustrates the embodiment disclosed in column 10, line 65, through column 11, line 8. The disclosure in the original specification and Fig. 8 enclosed herewith should provide full support for the subject matter of new claims 24-34. Further, the new drawing is not felt to be new matter as it is simply an illustration of the embodiment of the invention described in the specification of the patent.

For the afore-noted reasons, it is not felt the reissue declaration is defective, the claims are fully supported by the patent specification as well as new Fig. 8, and the claimed subject matter is distinct from the prior art. The reissue patent should therefore be granted.

Dated this March 30, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary M. Polumbus, Reg. No. 25,364
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4700
Denver, CO 80202-5647
Tel.: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450

USPTO Customer No. 20686

GMP/dtc
Enclosure: new Fig. 8